

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-16 are pending in this application. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected the Claims as follows. Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0204134 (Khazaka). Claims 8-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0139208 A1 (Tuli). Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Khazaka in view of by U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0126560 A1 (Kurapati). Claims 3 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Khazaka in view of Kurapati and further in view of Tuli. Claims 5-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Khazaka in view of Tuli.

Regarding the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, of Claim 11, the Examiner states that the term "further input-input information" renders the claim indefinite. Claim 11 has been amended to overcome the Examiner's rejection. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, of Claim 11 be withdrawn.

Regarding the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) of independent Claim 1, the Examiner states that Khazaka teaches each and every element of Claim 1. After reviewing the cited reference, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner is

incorrect.

The present invention as recited by the independent claims is drawn to an apparatus and a method for viewing a web page, which is wirelessly downloaded from the Internet, on a display of a mobile terminal. The contents of the entire web page are viewed using a direction key. The direction key is necessary for viewing because the limited size of the mobile terminal's screen prevents the user from viewing the entire web page on the display at a single time. Accordingly, as the viewer browses the displayed web page, the mobile terminal collects and manages the display information. After the user is finished viewing the web page, a web page turning command or a termination command is input by the user, and the mobile terminal collects the display information for the currently displayed web page and stores the collected display information. Accordingly, when the web page is revisited, the display information is used to display the previously displayed screen. For example, if a center section (as opposed to a left-most or right-most section) of a web page was displayed when the user entered a termination command, the display information would indicate that the center section of the web page was being viewed. Accordingly, when the web page is revisited, the center section of the web page is displayed.

Khazaka teaches a method and apparatus which collects a plurality of web content containing a plurality of keywords from a plurality of web sites and classifies the collected web content by screen size. Khazaka also discloses that the wireless

communication device can be configured to send an indication of the display screen size and that certain browsers can have a common screen size. In other words, Khazaka teaches displaying collected web pages according to groupings of screen size so that an entire web page can be displayed on a correspondingly sized screen. Accordingly, a web page which corresponds to the screen size of the wireless communication device is downloaded from the Internet and is displayed using the entire display screen which teaches away from the present invention. Moreover, Khazaka teaches if a Web page which does not correspond to the wireless communication device's screen size is downloaded, only a corner portion of the downloaded web page would be displayed on the display.

In contrast to that which is taught by Khazaka, Claim 1 recites a memory for storing previous display information of a web page previously visited by a user, and a controller detecting the previous display information of the web page from the memory, and displaying the web page utilizing the previous display information when the web page is re-visited, which is neither taught nor suggested by Kahzaka. Accordingly, in light of the arguments stated above, it is respectfully requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) of Claim 1 be withdrawn.

Regarding the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) of independent Claim 8, the Examiner states that Tuli teaches each and every element of Claim 8. After reviewing the cited reference, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner is incorrect.

Tuli discloses a system that allows multiple users operating a personal digital assistant (PDA) receiving information from a server via a cellular phone to access the Internet or World Wide Web (WWW) to view and interact with these pages remotely. Tuli further discloses that a web server is connected to the Internet and converts an image of a web page into a bit map format which is compressed and then sent via the cellular phone to the PDA. In other words, the PDA displays a bit map image of a part of a web page. As taught by Tuli, the PDA does not interact directly with the web page but is fed a bit map image with which the PDA responds. This can cause unnecessary delays and does not allow direct interaction with a web page when the PDA is not wirelessly connected to the web server. Moreover, Tuli teaches the pages are sent to the personal digital assistant as blocks of data which are assigned a priority and transmitted according to the corresponding priority.

In contrast, Claim 8 recites detecting previous display information of the loaded web page from an internal memory of the mobile terminal, and displaying the loaded web page utilizing the previous display information, which is neither taught nor suggested by Tuli. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) of Claim 8 be withdrawn.

Claims 17 and 18 have been added. Claim 17 recites that the controller further determines whether the previous display information is applicable; and Claim 18 recites

determining whether the previous display information is applicable, and wherein the step of displaying the loaded web page utilizing the previous display information when the web page is re-visited, is based upon the determination, which are neither taught nor suggested by Khazaka or Tuli or the combination thereof.

Independent Claims 1 and 8 are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Without conceding the patentability per se of dependent Claims 2-7, and 9-18, these are likewise believed to be allowable by virtue of their dependence on their respective independent claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of dependent Claims 2-7, and 9-16 is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 1-18, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicants' attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Farrell  
Reg. No. 33,494  
Attorney for Applicant

**DILWORTH & BARRESE, LLP**  
333 Earle Ovington Blvd.  
Uniondale, New York 11553  
Tel: (516) 228-8484  
Fax: (516) 228-8516  
PJF/VAG/ml